

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, February 23, 2006  
MAG Office  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

\*Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman  
Avondale: Michael Powell  
Buckeye: Lucky Roberts  
\*Chandler: Jim Weiss  
\*Gilbert: Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Doug Kukino  
\*Mesa: Scott Bouchie  
Phoenix: Gaye Knight  
#Scottsdale: Larry Person  
Surprise: Tony DeLaCruz for Jim Nichols  
Tempe: Oddvar Tveit  
\*Citizen Representative: Walter Bouchard  
\*American Lung Association of Arizona: Bill Pfeifer  
Salt River Project: Sunil Varma  
Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell  
\*Arizona Public Service Company: Jim Mikula  
#Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey  
#Valley Metro: Randi Alcott  
\*Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry  
Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish  
\*Arizona Rock Products Association: Russell Bowers  
\*Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Michelle Rill

Associated General Contractors: Amanda McGennis  
\*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona:  
Connie Wilhelm-Garcia  
\*American Institute of Architects - Central Arizona:  
Stephen J. Andros  
Valley Forward: Mannie Carpenter for Peter Allard  
\*University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension:  
Patrick Clay  
\*Arizona Department of Transportation: Beverly Chenausky  
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Peter Hyde  
Environmental Protection Agency: Wienke Tax  
Maricopa County Air Quality Department: Dena Konopka for Jo Crumbaker  
\*Arizona Department of Weights and Measures:  
Duane Yantorno  
Federal Highway Administration: Ed Stillings  
\*Arizona State University: Judi Nelson  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:  
Stan Belone for B. Bobby Ramirez  
\*David Rueckert, Citizen Representative

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.  
#Participated via telephone conference call.  
+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

Kathleen Sommer, Arizona Department of Transportation  
Gregory Little, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
William Crowley, Citizen  
Dianne Barker, Citizen

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on February 23, 2006. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, Acting Chair, began a discussion of the agenda items at approximately 1:35 p.m. since a quorum was not present. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association, and Randi Alcott, Valley Metro, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Ms. Knight stated that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the table adjacent to the doorway inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items and nonaction agenda items.

Ms. Knight recognized public comment from William "Blue" Crowley, Citizen, who requested five minutes to speak. Ms. Knight asked that five minutes be provided on the timer. Mr. Crowley distributed tables to the Committee that indicated the days when watches and High Pollution Advisories/warnings were issued for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 for 2004 through 2006. He indicated that he spent \$2.00 to make the copies for the Committee. Mr. Crowley referred to the bridge integrity in the Transportation Improvement Program Guidance Report. He mentioned that the Arizona Canal and the Grand Canal are his bike routes that he needs it to be done right. Mr. Crowley asked if there is a reason why when a bridge is taken out to upgrade to sufficiency that the bike tunnel is not put in at the same time. Mr. Crowley mentioned that there will be 55 new bus stops in 2009 and 2010. He stated that only 1,874 of the 6,900+ bus stops are covered. He added that bus stops are part of air quality because the more infrastructure the more citizens are aware that it functions and exists. Mr. Crowley mentioned that it needs to be done 24 hours per day/7 days per week and that bus drivers, first responders, police, fire, and all governmental workers need to be getting on the bus. He stated that the three largest employers are the City of Phoenix, State of Arizona, and Maricopa County. He said governmental employees need to be getting on the bus and he wants it mandated so that it is part of the solution. Mr. Crowley commented on Canamex and that until the route is changed it will go through central Phoenix. He asked if it is being included in the air quality modeling. Mr. Crowley mentioned the Hassayampa Study and asked if air quality is being considered. Mr. Crowley referred to his comments included in the Final Phase Input Opportunity Report. He asked if Grand Avenue between 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue is pedestrian and transit friendly. The response was that the ongoing Grand Avenue Major Investment Study is reviewing all opportunities for the bicycle, pedestrian, and transit. He asked then why spend \$7.3 million on the facility at Osborn and the Grand Canal. He stated that there needs to be a tunnel at Interstate 17 and Grand Avenue and the Grand Canal. Ms. Knight thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

4. Update on the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan Technical Criteria Document

Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided an overview of the supplement to the Technical Criteria Document for the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. He described the purpose of the document and mentioned examples of natural/exceptional events. Mr. Hyde stated

that the supplement includes natural/exceptional events that were not covered in the original document. He indicated that an example would be long distance transport of forest fire smoke.

Ms. Knight asked if a drought would be considered a natural event. Mr. Hyde replied that the initial document considered prior winter moisture and precipitation from the last 60 days as factors in determining natural/exceptional events. The current dry period would already be covered by the original document. However, some of the details may have changed. He stated that the general effort is to identify, specify, and then use as an exclusion mechanism those meteorological events that are truly exceptional.

Michael Powell, City of Avondale, asked how many days a drought would need to last for it could be considered exceptional. Mr. Hyde responded that neither the original document nor the revision try to account for a drought phenomenon in number of days. He added that if there was a day with extremely high winds that met the criteria, and with no rain for 125 days, it could count as an exceptional event if the winds were high enough. Ms. Knight asked if natural/exceptional events need to be tied to high winds. Mr. Hyde replied that for an exceedance to be flagged as a natural/exceptional event under drought conditions, there would need to be high winds.

Ms. Knight asked if the recent exceedances, which are likely tied to the drought conditions, could be considered natural/exceptional events. Mr. Hyde responded that adding stagnant conditions as a natural/exceptional event would be counter to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Natural and Exceptional Events Policy. He added that for regulatory and policy reasons, stagnation could not be included in the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan.

Ms. Knight asked what triggers daily monitoring. Mr. Hyde replied that daily monitoring is determined by the air quality district doing the work. He mentioned if the monitoring is based on one-in-six day sampling, and there is an exceedance, then the exceedance is multiplied by six. The result is six exceedances for that year, which is too many for the three year period. If there is an exceedance at a one-in-six day site and an every day monitor is installed to run for the rest of the year, and there are no more exceedances, then the one-in-six day exceedance is not multiplied by six. He added that Maricopa County primarily makes the decision of daily monitoring for the region.

Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, asked if EPA approves the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Wienke Tax, Environmental Protection Agency, responded that EPA does not formally approve the Plan. Mr. Kukino asked if the Plan can be amended at any time. Mr. Hyde mentioned that the recent revision includes a supplement to the Technical Criteria Document for the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Ms. Tax mentioned the difference between policies and plans and indicated that there are Natural Event Action Plans in place for Yuma and Tucson because of exceptional wind events. She added that EPA does not approve Natural Event Action Plans.

Mr. Kukino commented on recent discussions of possible natural/exceptional events that are not in the current Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. He indicated that the Plan may need to be revised again to incorporate some new ideas. Ms. Tax responded that the new transportation law (SAFETEA-LU) requires EPA to issue a proposal on the exceptional events guidance on March 1, 2006. She added that stagnant conditions is not sufficient reason to flag PM-10 data. Ms. Tax indicated that she will provide the proposal to the Chair to distribute to the Committee.

Mr. Kukino asked if the Committee has received the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, replied that ADEQ has been conducting a series of stakeholder meetings to receive comments and Shawn Kendall of ADEQ has presented to the Committee some of the issues in developing the supplement to the Technical Criteria Document for the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Ms. Bauer indicated that there was discussion at the last Committee meeting on the EPA 1986 Natural and Exceptional Events Policy. The document included criteria for exceedances caused by lack of precipitation and high winds, which was why the question was asked if stagnant conditions and extreme low precipitation could be considered a natural event. Ms. Tax replied that she believes a natural/exceptional event needs to be associated with wind, but will look at the language in the EPA proposal. Ms. Bauer asked if there would be a comment period for the proposal. Ms. Tax responded yes.

Ms. Tax asked what the schedule is for the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, replied that a letter explaining the procedures in place and future actions to be taken to minimize exceedances of the PM-10 standard in the Salt River Area was submitted to EPA on February 9, 2006.

Mr. Hyde commented that the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan can be revised. However, he would suggest that time be given to see how the latest revisions work. If the expanded and more inclusive criteria continue to miss events that are exceptional, then the document could be revised.

Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors, asked why stagnant conditions are not considered exceptional events. Ms. Tax replied that there would be a public comment period on the EPA exceptional events guidance proposal. Ms. McGennis commented that the region was not experiencing the current stagnant conditions when the latest revisions were made to the Arizona Natural Events Action Plan. Ms. Arnst referred to Section 6011 of SAFETEA-LU.

### 3. Approval of the January 26, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Knight announced that a quorum was now present and called the meeting to order. The Committee reviewed the minutes from the January 26, 2006 meeting. Mr. Powell moved to approve the January 26, 2006 meeting minutes. Ms. McGennis seconded the motion.

Ms. Knight recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley who commented on his statements included in the January 26, 2006 Committee meeting minutes. He indicated that a tunnel not a bridge is needed at Interstate 17 and Grand Avenue because a bridge would cost \$3.3 million and a tunnel would cost \$1.2 million. Since Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds are tight, he does not want them wasted. He commented on places where buses sit and idle. Mr. Crowley referred to the Maricopa County Vehicle Idling Restriction Ordinance that states that buses are allowed to idle for 30 minutes if the ambient temperature is 75 degrees Fahrenheit or less. If the temperature is greater than 75 degrees the vehicles can idle for one hour in any 90 minute period. He stated that this is not cleaning up the air and is not a judicious use of money. Mr. Crowley commented that the drought conditions are not unusual in the desert and will need to be dealt with in cleaning up the air. Ms. Knight thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Ms. Knight asked for a vote on the motion to approve the January 26, 2006 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

5. CMAQ Annual Report

Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided a briefing on the FY 2005 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Funds Annual Report. He mentioned that federal guidance requires an annual report to be prepared that specifies how CMAQ funds have been spent and the expected air quality benefits. Mr. Giles indicated that a copy of the detailed project listing report which was submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has been provided to the Committee. He mentioned that the report was prepared by MAG staff in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Transportation. He stated that MAG member agencies were also contacted for input needed to estimate the air quality benefits.

Mr. Giles mentioned that the report includes 32 projects that obligated in FY 2005. He discussed the information provided for each project and noted that air quality benefits for PM-2.5 were not calculated. Mr. Giles stated that, according to FHWA, the region is in attainment for PM-2.5 and therefore would not need to report the pollutant. Mr. Giles mentioned that design and right-of-way acquisition projects have estimated air quality benefits for the year in which the project would be implemented.

Mr. Hyde asked if a document is available that includes a full narrative report of how the pollution amounts were calculated. Mr. Giles replied that in 2005, the Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects were reviewed by the Committee. Mr. Hyde asked where he could find the calculations and assumptions used for each project. Mr. Giles responded that FHWA has no guidance on calculating air quality benefits for the CMAQ Annual Report. Ms. Bauer stated that the CMAQ Methodologies were used to calculate the air quality benefits for each project. Mr. Hyde asked if there is a report showing the CMAQ Methodologies application on a project level. Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, replied that there is a spreadsheet that includes all of the assumptions used for each project. She noted that there is a slight difference between this analysis and the CMAQ Methodologies in that the emissions were not weighted.

Mr. Hyde asked if there is a mechanism where MAG compares the achieved cost per ton to the effectiveness predicted. Mr. Giles responded that the methodologies used to evaluate the projects have improved since the projects were first programmed in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program; therefore, a direct comparison could not be made.

Mr. Powell asked how more than 100 percent of the funds available could be obligated. Mr. Giles replied that the CMAQ project amount column totals \$31,953,951 and that the apportioned amount is not correct. He stated that the numbers are generated by the online FHWA tracking system. The actual amount of CMAQ apportioned to Arizona for FY 2005 was \$43,039,432. He mentioned that there was approximately \$13 million in CMAQ funding that did not get obligated until after the close of FY 2005. Mr. Giles indicated that the funding went toward transit projects.

Ms. McGennis commented on language in SAFETEA-LU stating that CMAQ funds can be used to retrofit construction equipment. Mr. Giles stated that some provisions are provided in SAFETEA-LU for CMAQ funding to be used to retrofit diesel engines. Ms. McGennis asked if applications can be made to MAG. Ms. Bauer asked if private entities need to come through the cities for CMAQ funding. Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration, stated that the requests would need to come from the cities. He added that FHWA would likely release a guidance document at a future date. Ms. Tax mentioned that the old guidance allowed for public/private partnerships and she would assume it would still apply to the new criteria. Ms. Knight asked that the Committee be notified when the guidance is available.

6. Proposed New Air Quality Project for the MAG FY 2007 Work Program

Ms. Bauer provided an overview of the proposed new air quality project for the MAG FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program. She mentioned that the project is still under consideration. Ms. Bauer stated that with the Five Percent Plan for PM-10 and Eight-Hour Ozone Plan both due in the same general timeframe, MAG is anticipating that technical assistance may be needed. She indicated that the MAG Regional Council typically approves the Work Program in May. If the project is approved, the funding would be available beginning July 1, 2006.

Ms. Knight stated that Agenda Item #2, Call to the Audience, has been closed, but a member of the public who was not present at the beginning of the meeting has requested to speak. Ms. Knight asked if there were any objections to reopening the Call to the Audience. Hearing none, Ms. Knight recognized public comment from Diane Barker, Citizen, who thanked Ms. Knight for the opportunity to speak. She stated that she is concerned about the air and read the Environmental Impact Statement for Sky Harbor. Ms. Barker commented that Sky Harbor is in the MAG region. She indicated that comments can be made and mentioned where the document can be found. Ms. Barker stated that the Environmental Impact Statement for Sky Harbor has distinct numbers for airplanes as well as buses and cars that go through Sky Harbor. She expressed interest in the CMAQ Annual Report and commented on the Trip Reduction and Regional Rideshare Programs. Ms. Barker added that it was assertive for the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) to want to get 40 percent of cars off the road and increase the program from five percent to ten percent. She inquired about how RPTA plans to make that work. Ms. Barker asked if the MAG region is looking at a Pinal County study where there would be a road built from US 60 in Apache Junction to Eloy. She added that Pinal County is looking to be a model for innovative transportation for the United States. She challenged MAG to help reduce pollution with better transportation with Pinal County. Ms. Knight thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

7. Call for Future Agenda Items

Ms. Knight announced that the next meeting of the Committee is tentatively scheduled for March 23, 2006. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned.